

**Maywan Krach****I052**

**From:** Ruth Whitehouse <kvpoapresident@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 25, 2015 8:31 AM  
**To:** Placer County Environmental Coordination Services  
**Cc:** Ellie; Roger Patching; Ruth Whitehouse  
**Subject:** Martis Valley West Proposed Project

We are property owners in the Tahoe Basin, specifically the Kings Beach area. While we are not opposed to renovation and restoration of existing facilities and amenities, we are strongly opposed to more construction. We are opposed to new construction because we don't feel that previous projects have been completed and we see new projects as just more "unfinished" endeavors.

The Best Management Practices (BMPs) mandated several years ago have yet to be completed. Because of the lack of compliance by Owners, and the irresponsibility of public officials, 50-60% of Owners in the Tahoe Basin have yet to comply with the mandates of the BMPs. We are Owners who complied, to the amount of \$252,000.00 (a condo complex), well within the time allowed. The BMPs were intended to help preserve Lake Tahoe's clarity. Has that changed? Is more construction going to add to the lake's clarity, especially when no one is monitoring the projects?

I052-1

f

We own property adjacent to SR 267. At this time, there are several sections of SR 267 that are quite dangerous. It is a heavily traveled route between Truckee and Kings Beach, supporting construction and passenger traffic as well as cyclists. We believe new construction will have a definite impact on the traffic flow of SR 267, and add more danger to the existing conditions.

I052-2

The Biomass Plant proposed for Kings Beach was defeated by many hard-working organizations and a grass root effort by individual owners in the region. We hope that those same conscientious groups will again voice their strong opposition to the proposed project. At the rate we are going, we will soon mirror South Lake Tahoe in appearance; that is NOT why we bought property on the North Shore.

I052-3

Please clean up and finish projects already begun, before proceeding with another!

Respectfully,

Ruth and Bob Whitehouse

---

<b>I052</b>	<b>Ruth and Bob Whitehouse</b> <b>October 25, 2015</b>
-------------	---

---

I052-1	The comment expresses opposition to more construction and concerns regarding compliance with BMPs in the Lake Tahoe Basin. The comment does not specifically address the content, analysis, or conclusions in the Draft EIR. Please see response to comment I018-7, which explains that no portion of the West Parcel is located within the Lake Tahoe Basin.
I052-2	The comment expresses concern regarding traffic on SR 267. See Draft EIR Chapter 10, “Transportation and Circulation,” which describes the existing conditions and potential traffic and circulation effects associated with the MVWPSP.
I052-3	The comment expresses opposition to the MVWPSP. The Placer County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors will take the commenter’s opinions regarding the merits or qualities of the proposed MVWPSP into consideration when making decisions regarding the project.

1053

**From:** [Wintmobile@aol.com](mailto:Wintmobile@aol.com) [mailto:[Wintmobile@aol.com](mailto:Wintmobile@aol.com)]

**Sent:** Monday, December 21, 2015 6:43 PM

**To:** Placer County Environmental Coordination Services; Michael Johnson; Stacy Wydra

**Cc:** [caseybeyer01@yahoo.com](mailto:caseybeyer01@yahoo.com); [lawrence@dcnr.nv.gov](mailto:lawrence@dcnr.nv.gov); [shelly@tristatecommercial.com](mailto:shelly@tristatecommercial.com); [mlberkbigler@charter.net](mailto:mlberkbigler@charter.net); [tc@tcarlson.biz](mailto:tc@tcarlson.biz); [lizcarmel@gmail.com](mailto:lizcarmel@gmail.com); [tc@thecashmancompanies.com](mailto:tc@thecashmancompanies.com); [halcole@charter.net](mailto:halcole@charter.net); [nmcdermid@me.com](mailto:nmcdermid@me.com); [bkcegavske@sos.nv.gov](mailto:bkcegavske@sos.nv.gov); [mbrucetrpa@gmail.com](mailto:mbrucetrpa@gmail.com); [bosfive@edcgov.us](mailto:bosfive@edcgov.us); [lpsevison@sbcglobal.net](mailto:lpsevison@sbcglobal.net); [shutetrpa@gmail.com](mailto:shutetrpa@gmail.com); [jwytrpa@gmail.com](mailto:jwytrpa@gmail.com); [jmarchetta@trpa.org](mailto:jmarchetta@trpa.org); [jmarshall@trpa.org](mailto:jmarshall@trpa.org); [mambler@trpa.org](mailto:mambler@trpa.org)

**Subject:** Martis Valley West Project - draft EIR

To: Placer County Board of Supervisors

Re: Martis Valley West Project (MVW) Draft Environmental Impact Report

**I am writing to urge you to DENY approval for the Martis Valley West Project.**

My wife and I have a home on the West Shore of Lake Tahoe and have the following concerns about the Proposed Development of the Martis Valley area.

1) The Placer County proposed Area Plan says it will concentrate development in Town Centers in support of TRPA's 2012 Regional Plan. This Martis Valley development is in a forested area and not an urban area. This is against the TRPA Regional Plan and the Placer County Area Plan (to concentrate development in urban areas). This project is a massive development and will create urban sprawl in a currently forested area. This development, together with its proposed sister project, Brockway "Campground," is not near any existing infrastructure as claimed in the developer's proposal. The nearest existing development is Northstar, four miles away. Additionally, the development of a huge gated community of single and multi-family homes plus commercial is not compatible with existing zoning of forest/conservation.

1053-1

2) No development should be allowed on Tahoe's Ridge Lines. This Ridge Line development will ruin community character and scenic views for everyone during the day and night, including a loss of the special starry nights at Tahoe. It sets a precedent and justification for future development on Ridge Lines around the lake. Also, TRPA should not relinquish their regional territory and their responsibility to control the Ridge Lines around all of Lake Tahoe.

1053-2

3) Public evacuation and escape access in the event of an emergency, particularly near the lake, is a serious concern. People will be trying to evacuate from the lake area up Hwy 267, running into residents escaping from MVW and Northstar. The project would require widening Highway 267 from two to four lanes. At the summit leaving/going into Tahoe, however, it will still be two lanes – a scary bottleneck for residents who might have to get out of the Basin in a hurry in case of fire or other emergency.

1053-3

4) This development will cause substantial traffic congestion and gridlock. The total number of new occupants in the proposed 760 units could be 1,900, using 2.5 occupants per residence. It may not be this high all the time, but also may exceed this at peak times like holidays. However, the developer's Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) assumes a ridiculously low 20% occupancy rate in order to minimize the significant impact this number of new people and cars will have in the area.

1053-4

5) The cumulative impacts of this development have not been properly addressed in the EIR. Impacts should consider existing development (Northstar, etc) and other projected development and transit in the area.

1053-5

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this project. We hope that Placer & TRPA are listening to the community concerns.

Jerry Winters  
6770 Springs Court  
Tahoma, Ca. 96142

<b>I053</b>	<b>Jerry Winters</b> <b>December 21, 2015</b>
I053-1	<p>The comment notes that the proposed project is not located in an urban area, contrary to the 2012 Tahoe Regional Plan and Placer County Area Plan. As explained in Chapter 3, “Project Description,” and Section 4.1 of the Draft EIR, no portion of the MVWPSP West Parcel is located on lands under the jurisdiction of TRPA; therefore, it is not subject to the 2012 Tahoe Regional Plan or Placer County Area Plan. Potential impacts to zoning are evaluated in Draft EIR Impact 5-3, “Conflict with the Placer County General Plan, Martis Valley Community Plan, designations or zoning, or plan policies adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.”</p>
I053-2	<p>The comment expresses opposition to the project due to development of the ridge lines and adverse effects on night skies. Project-related impacts to scenic vistas and light and glare were thoroughly evaluated in the EIR and determined to be less than significant (see Draft EIR Impact 9-1, “Adverse effects on scenic vistas,” and Impact 9-4, “New sources of light and glare.”) The project would, however, contribute to cumulative significant and unavoidable light and glare impacts, as discussed in Cumulative Impact 9-9. Please also see Master Response 4, which discusses visual resources evaluation methodology. Also see responses to comments I027-1 and I050-3 regarding ridgeline protections.</p> <p>See also response to comment I018 -7, which explains that no portion of the West Parcel is located within the Lake Tahoe Basin. The Placer County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors will take the commenter’s opinions regarding the project and ridgeline protections into consideration.</p>
I053-3	<p>The comment expresses concern related to emergency evacuation. Please see Master Response 9 related to wildland fire, emergency evacuation, and the draft Emergency Preparedness and Evacuation Plan prepared as part of the MVWPSP.</p>
I053-4	<p>The comment asserts that project would result in substantial traffic congestion and gridlock. See Draft EIR Chapter 10, “Transportation and Circulation,” which describes the existing conditions and potential traffic and circulation effects associated with the MVWPSP. The traffic analysis in the Draft EIR is based on traffic volume data collected in August 2013 and March 2014; site visits conducted in May 2014; and incorporation, where appropriate, of data from local and regional transportation studies. The traffic study area includes roadways, intersections, and freeway facilities based on past studies in the Martis Valley area, the project’s expected travel characteristics, and consultation with staff from Placer County and Caltrans, as listed in Draft EIR Section 10.1.1. All technical calculations related to the traffic analysis are provided in Appendix I of the Draft EIR. Please see Master Response 9 related to wildland fire, emergency evacuation, and the draft Emergency Preparedness and Evacuation Plan prepared as part of the MVWPSP. For information on vehicle miles traveled, see Master Response 6.</p>
I053-5	<p>The comment asserts that the cumulative analysis should have included existing development, such as Northstar. As explained in Section 4.2.1 of the Draft EIR, “Cumulative Impact Approach,” the effects of past and present projects on the environment are reflected by the existing conditions in the project area. In addition, a list of probable future projects is provided in Table 4-2 of the Draft EIR. Probable future projects are those in the project vicinity that have the possibility of interacting with the proposed project to generate a cumulative impact (based on proximity and construction schedule) and either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▲ are partially occupied or under construction,</li></ul>

- ▲ have received final discretionary approvals,
- ▲ have applications accepted as complete by local agencies and are currently undergoing environmental review, or
- ▲ are proposed projects that have been discussed publicly by an applicant or that otherwise become known to a local agency and have provided sufficient information about the project to allow at least a general analysis of environmental impacts.

The Draft EIR cumulative list considers related projects likely to be constructed over the approximately 20-year buildout of the proposed MVWPSP. This time period was selected because it coincides with the timing of the introduction of project impacts (project impacts would be introduced by construction and operational activities); it is consistent with the timing requirements for water supply assessments (CCR Section 15155); and it would be speculative to forecast development beyond this 20-year timeframe.

Therefore, existing Northstar development is reflected in the environmental setting sections throughout the Draft EIR, and the Northstar Mountain Master Plan, Northstar Forest Flyer, Northstar Highlands Phase II, and Northstar at Tahoe Ski Trail Widening are listed in Table 4-2, along with many other related projects.

**Shirlee Herrington**

1054

**From:** Eric W <wolderic@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 22, 2015 11:05 AM  
**To:** Placer County Environmental Coordination Services  
**Subject:** Martis Valley West Parcel Project Comments

I am opposed to this development because of the negative environmental impacts it will cause. Campers will leave out food which will attract bears, with the end result being that some bears will be killed when they return to the area repeatedly. Not only will bears be killed, but increased traffic, smog, and destruction of the surrounding areas will be problems. Leave the area as is and deny any development permit.

1054-1

Regards,

Eric Wold

**I054**

---

**Eric Wold**  
**December 22, 2015**

---

I054-1

The comment expresses concerns related to campers. The MVWPSP does not include campsites. For concerns related to the separate Brockway Campground Proposal, see Master Response 2.

**Shirlee Herrington**

1055

**From:** heather <angelravengirl2000@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 27, 2015 8:17 PM  
**To:** Placer County Environmental Coordination Services  
**Subject:** Really??

There's a Reason people live in the Tahoe area NOT TO LIVE IN A BUILDING JUNGLE. STOP taking the open land and putting buildings on it. Leave My town alone Keep it green and open for Gods Sake. Martis Valley Don't touch it. theres way to many people here already. Stop forcing everyone to deal with more buildings and people if we wanted a Building jungle we would live in LA

1055-1



---

**I055**

---

**Heather (No Last Name Provided)**  
**October 27, 2015**

---

**I055-1**

The comment expresses opposition to the MVWPSP. The comment does not specifically address the content, analysis, or conclusions in the Draft EIR. The Placer County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors will take the commenter's opinions regarding the merits or qualities of the proposed MVWPSP into consideration when making decisions regarding the project.

This page intentionally left blank.